

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

RONALD DAVIDSON,

Plaintiffs,

22-CV-8936 (PGG) (VF)

-against-

ORDER

OFFICE OF COURT ADMINISTRATION;
LAWRENCE MARKS; ALIA RAZZAQ;
TRACEY FERDINAND; JOHN SULLIVAN;
JOHN DOE; and DENIS KEHOE,

Defendants.

-----X

VALERIE FIGUEREDO, United States Magistrate Judge:

There are four pending motions for the Court to take judicial notice in this case. See ECF Nos. 6, 7, 20, 21. There is also a motion to “modify docket entry text” at ECF No. 12. For the reasons explained below, Plaintiff’s motions are **DENIED**.

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, asks the Court to take judicial notice of: (1) funding for civil legal services (ECF No. 6); (2) another case brought by Plaintiff in this District, Davidson v. NYC Health and Hospitals Corporation, No. 22-CV-00764 (RA) (SDA) (ECF No. 7); (3) a 2016 “Barriers to Justice” report published by “MFY Legal Services” (ECF No. 20); and (4) an Eastern District of New York case, Friedman v. Office of Court Administration, No. 10-CV-3433 (ECF No. 21).

Plaintiff’s requests for the Court to take judicial notice are premature. No defendant has yet appeared in the case and there are no pending motions. As such, Plaintiff’s four motions for the Court to take judicial notice are denied without prejudice. Once there is a pending motion, if Plaintiff desires for the Court to take judicial notice of certain information in connection with that pending motion, he can renew his motion for the Court to take judicial notice.

Further, Plaintiff moves for the Court to modify the text of an ECF docket entry. See “Motion to Modify Docket Entry Text,” ECF No. 12. Specifically, Plaintiff takes issue with the text on the docket accompanying one of his motions to take judicial notice (ECF No. 6), which reads: “Motion to Take Judicial Notice (Without Oral Argument – Expedited Hearing Requested), *Re: Judicial civil legal services funding etc.*” (emphasis added). Plaintiff argues that the added words—“re: Judicial civil legal services funding etc.”—have the effect of “marginaliz[ing] the utility” of his motion. See ECF No. 12 ¶ 2. Because the underlying motion is denied, the motion to modify the docket entry text is similarly denied.

As such, the Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to terminate the motions at ECF Nos. 6, 7, 12, 20, and 21.

SO ORDERED.

DATED: New York, New York
 February 3, 2023



VALERIE FIGUEREDO
United States Magistrate Judge